MINUTES
Enterprise Architecture Committee

DATE	August 17, 2006
TIME	10:00 AM
LOCATION	Department of Information Technology – Conference Room 400 W. King Street, 3rd Floor Carson City, NV 89701
RECORDER	Christopher Ipsen, Enterprise Architect

ATTENDEES

Name	Attend	Name	Attend
Chair – Dave McTeer Dept. of Administration	✓	David Miller Dept. of Information Technology	✓
Co-Chair – Terry Savage Dept. of Information Technology		Dan O'Barr Dept. of Corrections	
Gary Buonacorsi Welfare Division	✓	Cheryl Purvis Dept. of Information Technology	✓
Chuck Conner Dept. of Motor Vehicles	✓	Alan Rogers Personnel	✓
Laurie Flynn Business and Industry	✓	Roger Sliva Dept. of Information Technology	
Steve Ingersoll Health Division	✓	Lani Smith Secretary of State	
Chris Ipsen Dept. of Information Technology	✓	Dave Stewart Dept. of Employment, Training & Rehabilitation	
John Lusak Attorney General		Andrew Tucker Gaming Control Board	
Alisanne Maffei Dept. of Information Technology	✓	Doug Wells Dept. of Public Safety	
Terri Mark Cultural Affairs		Tom Wolf Nevada Dept. of Transportation	

I Call to Order

Dave McTeer called the meeting to order. The question about quorum in a committee meeting was raised and Alisanne Maffei confirmed that any convened group for the meeting represented a quorum. After a review of the March minutes Gary Buonacarsi moved to accept and Chuck Conner seconded; the motion passed unanimously.   Steve Ingersoll moved to accept the July Meeting Minutes and Laurie Flynn seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

II Enterprise Data Model – Data Input

- The first phase of the Enterprise Action Framework, the Data Input Phase, was presented. The presentation highlighted portal technologies and focused on how enterprise data is gathered and access is protected. Items discussed were a modular approach to accessing applications, auditing, electronic payments, and identity management. Common look and feel for citizen access and workflow after the data was acquired were also discussed.

- Strategic opportunities within the existing 2008 – 09 Technology Improvement Requests (TIRs) were discussed. Specifically the Health Division Proposal for a business portal.   This portal was discussed in enterprise terms as having the capacity to service many agencies doing business in the state. Other statewide opportunities were also cited. Gary Buonacorsi stated that Welfare was looking at enterprise data integration software that could potentially be used by the state. Gary also discussed the possibilities of an Enterprise Service Bus and how the integration software might be able to accomplish these needs.   Chuck Conner stated DMV has, and would continue, to work with state agencies to leverage their capacity to use electronic credit card payments.

- There was a discussion around the qualification, elevation and /or development of enterprise capacities. Alan Rogers made a suggestion that a definition of enterprise needed to be made. He stated that the enterprise consisted of all agencies within the state. Chris Ipsen suggested that there also needed to be a definition of enterprise applications. Having these definitions provides a framework against which existing enterprise capacities within agencies could be supported and/or elevated to the state for the mutual benefit of all state agencies.

III Technology Improvement Request (TIR) Pre – Planning Proposal

- As an extension of the discussion on enterprise capacities, it was suggested by Chuck that the Planning Division use the TIR process to facilitate enterprise development of applications. A proposal was made to develop a pre-planning questionnaire for TIR requests that would leverage enterprise capabilities. It was suggested that agencies respond to these questions prior to developing a TIR. If the questions demonstrated that the capacity has enterprise ramifications, or that multiple agencies were attempting the same process, the TIR could be developed collaboratively with an enterprise perspective between multiple agency sponsors. Laurie Flynn suggested that pre-planning TIR questions be basic in nature to insure that lay people could understand the questions. Dave McTeer suggested that a series of questions be developed for discussion with the IT Strategic Planning Committee.

IV Agency Enterprise Initiatives

- A new section was added to the ongoing meeting agenda titled "Agency Enterprise Initiatives". This ongoing section will focus on providing agencies the opportunity to showcase enterprise initiatives that are ongoing within their own networks and solicit the input from other agencies.

V Enterprise Opportunity Initiative

- A proposal was submitted by the Enterprise Architect that a budgetary capacity be developed within the state to encourage agencies to share with the state enterprise previously purchased software, support, and capacities. By doing this the overall capacity would benefit a larger number of agencies and would diminish silos. The proposal is:

Enterprise Opportunity Proposal

Executive Overview

The Enterprise Architect (EA) is proposing that funds be earmarked for maintenance and support of existing Enterprise Capacities residing within individual agencies.

Current Condition

Currently, some agencies have purchased, or are considering the purchase of enterprise systems or capacities that have the ability to address their specific needs. These systems may also have the capacity to serve many more agencies without impacting the primary agencies' line of work. Other agencies may also be considering the purchase of similar systems. If the second agency purchases a like system, we develop silos of similar capacities.

In most cases, these systems are purchased with dedicated "one shot" funds. Some examples are: videoconferencing bridges, enterprise scheduling, licensing programs, geographic information systems (GIS), and emergency call down systems. In most cases the primary cost is the initial purchase with annual maintenance fees of 10% - 20% of the initial cost.

In many cases the initial cost exceeds $100,000 dollars.

Opportunity

Multiple agencies have expressed an interest in sharing their enterprise capacity with other agencies within the state; however, they are not well suited to spread the cost between agencies.

The EA is proposing that in cases where agencies have enterprise capacities that have been qualified as having an enterprise benefit to the state as a whole, and where the agencies have agreed to share the capacity with the state, the state will set aside funds to pay for the support and maintenance of these enterprise capacities. Support can be defined as hosted space, specialized technical support personnel, and utilization of Silvernet resources.

Benefits

Whereas the citizens of the state are the constituents of all agencies, they will benefit from a consistently high level of service and common interface with all agencies with which they do business. Smaller agencies will benefit from the achievements of larger agencies.

Costs

Whereas every dollar spent on this project would represent a savings to the state as a whole, funding for these types of projects should be encouraged at the highest possible level. Payment for this service should be assessed as an enterprise service.

VI Conclusion

The next meeting date was scheduled for September 21, 2006.

Committee Contact Information:

Alisanne Maffei, Strategic Planner

Awmaffei@doit.state.nv.us

Phone 684-5855

Costs

Whereas every dollar spent on this project would represent a savings to the state as a whole, funding for these types of projects should be encouraged at the highest possible level. Payment for this service should be assessed as an enterprise service.

VI Conclusion

The next meeting date was scheduled for September 21, 2006.

Committee Contact Information:

Alisanne Maffei, Strategic Planner

Awmaffei@doit.state.nv.us

Phone 684-5855